

Chuck Kleinhans

Radio/Television/Film

Northwestern University

Always on the Margins: Early U.S. Experimental Film

a lecture for the symposium, "The Origins of Modernism: Early 20th Century Perspectives on American Culture," Mary and Leigh Block Gallery, April 6, 1991.

The other lecturers at this symposium address their specific concern within the framework of established art traditions: literature, photography, dance, music, and watercolor. Whatever changes they note, whatever modernism comes to mean, their discussion takes place with a clear canon their artists join, deform, or reject, and a solidly established institutional framework or "artworld" that allows for production and innovation. But to talk of independent art film before World War 2, I cannot talk in the same way for two central reasons.

First, there is no established canon or tradition. Therefore it's deceptive to even use the term avant-garde, for there is no main body or rear guard to discuss. There are only individually variant examples which have been retrospectively grouped and that very grouping, I would argue has been to serve other agendas. In other words, a history has been written which then validates the historian's own evaluation of the present. The clearest example, and certainly the currently dominant reading of the early U.S. art film has been stated by P. Adams Sitney in his *Visionary Film*: ...According to Sitney, before

Maya Deren's first film, *Meshes of the Afternoon*, in 1943, all the significant examples of independent film art are pale derivatives of the European avant garde cinema. The achievement of *Meshes* is that it marks a truly new American cinema, an expression of the visionary tradition of (essentially British literary) Romanticism. (It might help to know that Sitney wrote his book after being a student of literary critic Harold Bloom at Yale whose best known early study of the English Romantics, *The Visionary Company*, was clearly on Sitney's mind. [I've developed a critique of Sitney elsewhere at some length; Bloom is subsequently better known as a defendant in a sexual harassment case at Yale, at least among feminist academics] Others have simply continued Sitney's interpretation, such as John Hanhardt in and Lucy Fisher in the MOMA Film catalogue.

Second, there was not, until after WW2, a sufficient and stable institutional setting to actually have an independent art cinema in the U.S. The first museum series, the first regular academic film departments, the first film societies which created the space to actually screen experimental cinema did not exist until after the war, so what we find if we look for an artworld earlier is an assortment of precursor, temporary, and emerging institutions none of which was stable enough to actually assure that any one artist could actually have a career, even as an unpaid artist.

To draw a conclusion from these two situations, or (perhaps more accurately) to state my own underlying position, what we have is a situation which underlines the always present, even when unacknowledged interrelationship between aesthetics and sociology, between art objects, performances, or texts, and the artworld that brings them into being. And a correlary position: This relationship is always clarified by thorough historical investigation.

But before proceeding any further, I should establish a few terms and concepts that guide my analysis here. I'm sure that it's already crossed the minds of some that of course the cinema as a commercial entity did exist before and during the time frame I am using here. And of course we might want to argue that many examples of the commercial entertainment film, or perhaps the entire institution, deserves the term "art." We have only to think of the work of D. W. Griffith or Charlie Chaplin or Joseph Von Sternberg to give assent to the idea of "film art" in the Hollywood dramatic narrative film. But we might also remember that the period of the economic-industrial consolidation of the U.S. film industry at the end of the "teens, that is the creation of the Hollywood studio system, and the definitive coalescing of what is now called the "Classic Hollywood Film" as a form around 1920 takes place precisely when we can begin to talk of the first stirrings of an early American avantgarde cinema. In other words, I am arguing that these two phenomena are related, and that with the creation of a dominant commercial film art we have the possibility of an ongoing alternative or marginal noncommercial film art.

We may recognize some people, typically directors (a point of controversy within film studies), in the commercial system. However, there is also a strong sense with which we recognize those figures who, in the capitalist era of human history, essentially since the rise of Romanticism in the west, operate not simply within the commercial-industrial production of art and its attendant institutions, but who chose to see themselves (perhaps naively) as autonomous professionals, as artists who stand in a critical relationship to the tradition of their own medium (particularly in its institutionalized forms, be those of academic art or successful gallery art) and who thus are recognized as producing art for personal, expressive purposes while maintaining a career orientation to the field.

Now that's a sentence worthy of a German art historian, so let me repeat it.

However, there is also a strong sense with which we recognize those figures who, in the capitalist era of human history, essentially since the rise of Romanticism in the west, operate not simply within the commercial-industrial production of art and its attendant institutions, but who chose to see themselves as autonomous professionals, as artists who stand in a critical relationship to the tradition of their own medium (particularly in its institutionalized forms, be those of academic art or successful gallery art) and who thus are recognized as producing art for personal, expressive purposes while maintaining a career orientation to the field.

Certainly almost all the figures celebrated in this exhibition and in the symposium are artists in that sense, even though they may have also some experience in the commercial-industrial sector. [I'm putting aside here the issue of cross over, independent sector as training ground, etc.]

So, within the framework of looking for film art which is produced by an artist under essentially artisanal conditions, and distributed and exhibited without direct and overriding concern for commercial profitability, we find ourselves defining the field using three necessary but unsatisfactory terms: independent, experimental, and avant garde. As I said, we can speak of the avant garde, but with respect to film we then have no main body or rear guard for this movement to be in advance of. But the term may be useful in letting us make a bridge to the other arts, and to describe those artists who work in film as well as in other arts, and who sometimes have an allegiance to a well recognized forward looking art movement. And in fact one of the virtues of this symposium is that it creates the conditions for considering early U.S. art cinema as part of a more general development in the various arts, as part of U.S. culture at a moment of

decisive change. In fact I was inspired in the past week in reading the short published descriptions of the other lectures. Each one suggested to me another facet or connection with the emerging revisionist analysis of the early avant garde.

Of the other two terms used to describe the field, "independent" has the advantage of specifying both an economic and intentional situation (separate from the Hollywood commercial system and made by people who set their own priorities in art making), but it can just as plausibly be used to discuss much of the documentary film tradition.

"Experimental" represents a stance in relation to the mode of filmmaking itself, and is perhaps the best overall term at present. At least for my purposes, which is to include what I call experimental documentary along with narrative, lyrical, and visual innovation, of which I will speak shortly.

So, to be engaged in a revisionist history of the U.S. independent film movement of the 20s and 30s, as I am along with a number of other scholars, is an act which is itself informed by and a reflection on the current issues of avant garde film and video. The Hanhardt and Sitney histories had a hidden agenda which was to validate one specific tradition within the independent sector, one which basically can be interpreted largely within the framework of Clement Greenberg's (and similar) aesthetics, one which validates those works which can be interpreted as being about the process of art, about the investigation of its own nature. Both end with a validation of the cinematic rough equivalent of abstract expressionism, and then the emergence of "structural" film as the logical continuation of the visionary concerns of an earlier period. "Structural film" is closest to minimalism in painting. And it is no mistake that this fits the dominant Cold War agenda for intellectuals of the time Sitney and Hanhardt were writing.

Of course it does no good to simply construct another alternative history which also rests on a hidden agenda. Rather, what can and should be done is to put the agenda up front so that all can see the way the present issues and priorities are helping to shape our perception of the past, both in terms of what we look for, how we construct the canon, and what aesthetic validation we give to different aspects of it. As we go back to look at the experimental film movement from the vantage point of today and the issues that surround current art, especially film and video, we must see things differently.

First of all, we must see things from a postmodern sensibility, which in film and video has a distinct tradition and character which I cannot detail here. But such a position lets us see the cinematic expressions of Pop Art, especially its appropriation of mass culture, as essential, and leads us back through Bruce Connor and Andy Warhol in film to Joseph Cornell. Such a sensibility also invites us to look for impure mixings, for example, for documentaries which become personal or expository or editorial rather than staying within the tradition of the social documentary in the John Grierson tradition. It allows us to look for comic work which goes beyond the rather sober tone of realism or even surrealism. And it also allows us to re-examine the documentary tradition and see much of its work in a different light, once which we might want to claim from an expanded understanding of the avant garde position.

And the presence of new social movements today which themselves are finding unique artistic expression as part of their political direction, calls on us to rethink our look backward for predecessors. and I'm thinking most immediately of AIDS media, of which we had a very stimulating expression a few weeks ago in the Block Gallery, but also Feminist and Black, Latino, and Asian film and video making. Of course we are not going back to find very many, , women making experimental work. We have only the

example of Mary Ellen Bute in the 30s, and the sad truth that people of color did not have access to film and video training equipment and the necessary budgets to produce such work. Indeed, it is only in the late 50s with Edward Bland's *THE CRY OF JAZZ* that we have the first example of experiential media art by an African American. However, that very awareness should help us think more critically, more fully, about what we do have from the past.

But I'm getting ahead of myself, something which is perhaps inevitable when trying to construct a more dialectical history. So let me stop for a moment and mark one very important material factor in the contemporary revision of experimental film. That factor is the remarkable increase in film archives and programs of acquisition and preservation in the past ten years or so. It is only now, partly through the preservation program of the American Film Institute and the NEA, and through the work of individual archivists and historians that we are beginning to uncover and establish the objects, the actual films, which form our past. Many have already been lost, but there are also new discoveries being made, and copies of rare films being made, so that we are in the process of finding a lost or obscured series of film which actually form an aesthetically significant body of work from before WW2.

Having explained some of the problems in finding a pre-WW2 avant garde cinema, I'm in a position to discuss this still emerging field. In moving back to the dim halls of the past and of cinema itself, we are fortunate to discover a guide for this journey, a Virgil, in the form of Lewis Jacobs, one of the early historians of U.S. cinema, as well as a filmmaker and participant in the creation of a film culture in the 20s, 30s and 40s. Unfortunately, Jacobs' pioneering history, which was a standard work in the 60s was found to have many problems of fact and interpretation when scholars proceeded to do

more specialized studies of the American cinema, and thus the appendix to his history of commercial film, an essay, "experimental Cinema in America: 1921-1947," has been neglected by subsequent researchers, but in that essay, written in 1947 from his direct memory of films and filmmakers, he indicates several dozen innovative independent predecessors to Maya Deren, and he also expands the field beyond purely visionary concerns. Though we still do not have preserved and accessible many of the works Jacobs mentions, it is clear from reading his account that a major retrospective of this work and a reassessment of it would drastically alter current norms. For example, we have yet to come to terms with the highly poetic and abstract organization of photographer and filmmakers Ralph Steiner's studies *H2O* and *Surf and Seaweed*. The abstract light, shadow and sound compositions of Mary Ellen Bute also deserve reconsideration as aesthetic objects in their own right as well as early examples of graphic cinema in the US (she was also the first to use electronic imagery in film for experimental purposes--a precursor of computer graphics). Similarly James Sibley Watson and Melville Webber's *Lot in Sodom* (1934), formerly assigned a low place in the overly art historical sequencing of experimental film history, which assigned it a position as a pale imitation of German Expressionism, takes on a different character in light of the important current reconstruction of gay and lesbian film history. Here is Jacobs description:

In its brilliant array of diaphanous shots and scenes, --smoking plains, undulating curtains, waving candle flames, glistening flowers, voluptuous faces, sensual bodies, frenzied orgies--were so smoothly synthesized on the screen that the elements of each composition seemed to melt and flow into one another with extraordinary iridescence.

Most startling in Jacob's history is his mention of 15 films from the early 30s which he sees as directly derived from Dziga Vertov's theory and practice. Given the current positive re-evaluation of Vertov, heightened by Annette Michelson's recent critical edition of the Soviet documentaryists' writings, a retrospective of these American children of the Russian innovator would be topical and revealing. Jacobs himself wrote as a leading critic of independent film in the Early 30s. With others he published five issues of *Experimental Cinema* (1930-1933) which championed both left wing politics and innovative filmmaking. (you can see why I prefer to use the term *Experimental*). With a special interest in Soviet film, the magazine included translations from and discussions of the Russian cinema and tried to save Einstein's *Que viva Mexico* from Upton Sinclair's mutilation. In the second issue Jacobs argued that critics needed to replace their moral, literary, and pictorial approaches to film by understanding film as a plastic art based on time, motion, and image. Articles in *Experimental Cinema* also took up issues of unionization in Hollywood, imperialist exploitation of Cuban images and movie markets, and the development of a worker's cinema. *Experimental cinema* did not last very long, but it gave evidence of radical film professionals with a genuine native concern for developing politically and aesthetically progressive cinema in the U.S.

According to Jacobs, worsening economic conditions and rising political resistance pushed most independents toward social documentary by the mid-30s. Two excellent recent studies of the 30s Worker's Film and Photo League and related political documentary by William Alexander and Russell Campbell detail that history. The radical documentaries were formally as well as politically innovative, especially when compared to the commercial newsreel and travelogue type of documentary prevalent at the time. For example, instead of shots of demonstrations placed safely beyond the action, taken with telephoto lenses and cameras mounted on tripods, the Film and Photo League

newwreels showed hand held hats from the midst of the protestors. Nevertheless, the overall production of those films usually subordinated artistic innovation to an assumed need for conventional communication, populist and Popular Front rhetoric, and Native Land, arguably the movement's greatest achievement, has a call to yeomanry and patriotic values which seems strangely naive and sentimental to later radicals. Although, with a slight update, in fact it has almost the same rhetoric as the Reagan presidency with a patriotic and optimistic appeal to the white working man and a strata of middle class that was a core of the Reagan constituency. It's curious how 40 years later we find a conservative Movie Star president using the same discourse in the 1980s as we find in an avowedly left wing film from 1941.

From a contemporary perspective, I find much more compelling some of the League's marginal works such as Maurice Bailens well executed home movies of May Day marches and communist picnics--fascinating for their visual documentation of everyday life in the Party--and C.O. Nelson's Halsted Street, a long travelling shot on the famous Chicago Street, displaying daily life and diverse ethnic neighborhoods. The comic sort Pie in the Sky (Elia Kazan, Molly Day Thatcher, Irving Lerner, and Ralph Steiner) uses simple camera and editing tricks with a partially improvised sorty satirizing the Salvation Army approach to the Depressions suffering--a visual repetition of the old Wobbly song, "They'll Pie in the Sky When you Die, That's a Lie." The short silent film contains an antic set of adventures showing down-and-outers having spontaneous fun in a junkyard. When a film asserts a vision of the oppressed's creative imagination, it stands out as notably different from the more common image of noble suffering and virtuous leftism often used in the social documentary tradition.

Jacobs mentions two additional developments that shaped experiential cinema. In 1935 the Museum of Modern art recognized film as an art worthy of support by beginning the low cost distribution of notable classics to nonprofit exhibitors. This distribution service created the basis for film study in university classrooms and exhibition in film societies. In addition, MoMA's regular screenings of film art had a profound effect in New York city (traditionally the US city with the heaviest per capita movie attendance) by providing general public access to otherwise unseen work.

Following up on Jacob's lead, a number of curators and scholars are now involved in a major reassessment of the experiential film, the first results of which will be forthcoming in Jan-Christopher Horak's anthology, *Early American Avant garde Film (1919-1945)*. As I mentioned before, the opportunity to do archival research, to find and view films previously unknown or unavailable is changing our understanding of what a film history of this period might be. Rather than finding simply a scattered few examples of artists and photographers who made one or two films and then gave up, rather than finding all the work pale and derivative of the French, German, or Soviet cinema of the 20s, what we see is the problems and achievements of an emerging art form based in a new technology--and perhaps this is the most compelling immediate reason for studying it today, for today we are surrounded by emerging art forms based in new technologies. Understanding how such new art forms come into being, how an artworld is created and sustained, has a genuine immediacy. We are also in the present redefining and rediscovering the institutions of the past which supported an alternative cinema. Patricia Zimmerman's work on the amateur tradition, one which goes back to the 20s and which was highly organized into clubs and festivals and classes has shown us new ways of understanding the infrastructure of independent work, and invited us to cast our nets more widely in looking at past work.

But I don't mean to imply that there is not sufficient aesthetic reason for looking back. Increasingly critics are validating the past work as it and its context becomes known, as aesthetically worthy. And it is being understood in somewhat different terms than before.

Manhatta 1921 by Paul Strand and Charles Sheeler can be understood not only as the first of the City Symphony films, but also as a distinctly American film with its intertitles quoting from the Walt Whitman poem. It also needs re-interpretation in terms of the rather impressionist style, much closer to the photosecessionist style than the later work (or even judging by Sheeler's watercolors of River Rouge in the exhibition, like strands moragn guaraanteee trust photo) With its celebration of New York it is also a contribution to the visual mythology of Manhattan, part of a long tradition in the avant garde that runs through Shirley Clarke's Bridges Go Round into the 1950s and Peter Hutton, Chantal Ackerman and James Benning's New York cityscapes in the avant garde of the 70s and 80s.

Jay Leyda's *A Bronx Morning* and Hiram Weinberg's *Autumn Fire*, from the present, can be viewed as also contributing to the city genre.

Robert Florey's *Life and Death of 9413*, can be seen not as simply a poverty level attempt to duplicate German Expressionism, but as both a clever and biting satire on the entire Hollywood system and a make-do table top narrative, something of a sub genre in contemporary video art (*The Karen Carpenter Story*, done with Barbi Dolls)

Mary Ellen Bute's abstract films from the 30s can be understood as the first US abstract films and a worthy native contribution to abstract animation, certainly an equally innovative contribution which was soon joined in the 30s by the exiled Oscar Fischinger.

And in narrative work of the 30s, Paul Strand's *The Waves*, shot in Mexico with Fred Zinneman, can be viewed as the creation of a distinct narrative alternative to both Hollywood and the narrative impulse in the social documentary tradition. Through its extraordinary visual accomplishment, it achieves the highest levels of cinematic expression and remains arguable the finest pre-war achievement in US alternative cinema.

Theodore Huff, December 20, 1905-March 15, 1953

article for anthology on early US experimental film

Edmund Newell Huff, Jr. changes name to Theodore after graduation from Princeton;
dies of cerebral hemorrhage at Mother's house, Farmingdale Long Island

a cinema nerd and/or priest of the cinema (as he imagines it) intellectual in the first half century of cinema

[explanation of biographic/auteur analysis?]

a **symptomatic** typical? (emblematic?) figure of the early US experimental cinema

in studying him we see the situation of an emerging independent cinema in relation to a larger corporate capitalist industry.

some basic theses

the large scale mass media systems of the modern era--the corporate and industrial production and diffusion of sound/image material--need intellectuals who work within and around and in relation to them. Today we know these social formations and the intellectuals who fit in them in a fairly complex and articulated state: we understand and expect specialist division of labor. However in looking at Huff's career we see someone who doesn't occupy a simple or single position, but rather someone who fits into several different positions at different times depending upon the evolution of the field. As an intellectual worker, he is part of the army of surplus labor: he can be brought into service when the evolving system needs certain key skills, but as an individual he is never strong enough to actually command a premium for his specialized abilities. Today he would be able to find a niche for his talents because the system as a whole is sufficiently specialized to validate and employ someone with such skills. [And to teach them the related skills needed to hold down a job? example: Huff teaches college level film courses, but is awful at it. Had he gotten a Ph.D. he would have been socialized into fitting in to the expectations. In other words, he might have been a dull and fairly inept teacher, but he would have known how the system operated and could have probably kept his job, or kept some kind of academic job in an expanding film job market.] However, in the still-developing media culture of the first half of the 20th century, Huff did not have a place, one place, and occupied several different ones at different times.

However there are certain problems with making such a statement. The main one being that given his individual personality--the fact that he gives ample evidence of being deeply neurotic--it is hard to see him as a lasting success at anything. There's also a problem in terms of placing him within the avant-garde or experimental or independent sector because that very section of the media world was in the process of becoming at the time. (discuss various historical constructions of the period: Sitney, Jacobs, etc.)

Major moments of his life/career

Childhood, Englewood NJ, 1905-

son of a physician (who dies--date unknown); one brother, George who remains virtually unmentioned in the papers. One reference from a friend who saw him; a few references in the correspondence about the collection being donated to GEH

late childhood and early adolescence during WW1 boom period of Fort Lee NJ studios. Huff often hung out at the nearby studios, observed filmmaking in his own town which was frequently used as a location

Prep School, Phillips Andover

GEH collection contains some of his essays

Princeton, (class of 27, graduates 28)

participates in student theatre group

Theatre Intime, he does stage work, scenery

writes English composition essays: D. W. Griffith as greatest artist of 20th c;

Lillian Gish as great actress

claims later in self-prepared bio that he spent several years on Wall Street after graduation (only evidence, no other record)

MoMA Film Library, Dec 26, 1935-May 31, 1940

My main job is arranging the musical accompaniment for the old silent pictures (I used to play in a summer theatre, have some of the old movie music, and was always interested in that field. TH undated reply to Flory, d. April 17, 1936, m. April 30, 1936

National Archives, Washington DC, July 1, 1942-Feb 15, 1946

two letters refer to position with United Nations c 45; dec 1945, iDirector, Motion Picture Department, United Nations Headquarters

Motion Picture Dept. NYU, Sept. 1946-

Cinema Dept. USC, summer 1948

Cinema Dept (?) CCNY, dec. 1950

letter from ABC regarding his work with them--TV
gets publisher for Chaplin bio, c. 1949

US Army Signal Corps (Astoria), civil service

at time of death, assistant casting director, Signal Corps Photographic Center, Astoria

categories of his intellectual labor

his career consists of a series of moments, each stage or part started and then interrupted without a real continuity and momentum

filmmaker

as amateur, with Amateur Cinema League in club-like environment

a function of that historical moment--see Patti Zimmerman diss

as crew/collaborator on independent work

Florey

as part of avant garde

with Kent Munson, but limited at that moment

1948, exam from Munson (student in his NYU class)

1948 contract with Munson for film, The Murderer

historian/scholar

Chaplin biography, his greatest achievement

definitive within its time, and years afterward (check D. Robinson, etc.);

essentially factual, not analytical (compare Parker Tyler)

the Sight and Sound Indexes: Chaplin, Lubitsch (no. 60?)

unpublished, but circulated materials: eg complete typescript of Birth of a Nation including shot length (done at MOMA?)

unpublished, but circulated lists of hundreds of errors in Lewis Jacob's History (eg, date of film off by one year--errors of fact, not questions of emphasis or interpretation)

early 30s? Films for a Permanent American Theatre (or Museum) of the Cinema (list of about 100, The Informer, most recent, based on quality [compare argument against Deming])

collector

collection of film stills (15,000 he estimates in late 40s; 30,000 in donation to GEH) (ask Chris)

a resource for many others--Parker Tyler's book on Chaplin, etc. see also letter to publisher re Deems Taylor's Pictorial History of Cinema (check title) apparently he allowed MoMA to make many copies of his still collection which they then proceeded to dupe and sell to others.

silent film music and cue sheets

plays in theatres, then later with screenings at various venues (film clubs, etc.), then at MoMA as arranger for screening accompaniment.

but significantly, he is never able to really make a business out of this

critic

program notes, endlessly refined and reprinted; peculiar art of the the two page note

Films in Review, National Board of Review check

representing criticism of a certain era and moment; evaluative criticism of masterpieces, or the worthwhile, fundamentally in aesthetic terms derived from the cinema itself; takes for granted much else.

teacher

NYU, USC, CCNY--apparently a flop at all of them

runs various film clubs. series

as a person, social being

He seems basically unable to imagine how others thought of him--unable to project himself into others...thus unable to actually write dramatic screenplays except as parody;

He is entranced by old films, by silent film, but unable to develop a larger analysis of them except to appreciate their technique (which he has a great practical mastery of).

He is continually insecure and underrates himself; at times exhibits passive-aggressive syndrome

in 40s writes to Gish and Chaplin decrying MoMA when he learns of their gifts to the Film Library

Jan 1952 proposes article on MoMA ifilms stolen (by them!)î, films burned and ruined, political activities, lack of scholarship

ltr. from mother, 1946, tells him to look for a "wife" (in quotes in original) and settle down